

## **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 19, and 49 are amended herein. Claims 14, 16, 18, 32, 34, and 36 are cancelled herein. Claims 37-48 were previously cancelled. Claims 3, 5-6, 9-10, 21, 23-24, 27-28, and 50 were previously withdrawn. Claims 1-13, 15, 17, 19-31, 33, 35, and 49-50 are pending and under consideration.

Support for the claims as amended can be found in the specification, as originally filed, at page 11, lines 14-21.

Applicants have timely filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with this Amendment, including the filing fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of any Office action and enter this Amendment for consideration under 37 CFR 1.114.

### **I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action, at page 2-3, claims 1-2, 4, 7-8, 11-20, 22, 25-26, 29-36 and 49 were rejected under the first and second paragraphs of 35 USC § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement and as being indefinite. Independent claims 1, 19, and 49 have been amended in response to these rejections. The remaining claims either depend from claims 1 and 19 or have been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, claims 14, 16, 18, 32, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being inoperative. Claims 14, 16, 18, 32, 34, and 36 have been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 101 rejections is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, at pages 4-6, claims 1-2, 4, 7-8, 11-13, 15, 17, 19-20, 22, 25-26, 29-31, 33, 35 and 49 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,658) in view of Leedy (U.S. Patent No. 5,103,557).

Taff et al. and Leedy, alone or in combination, do not discuss or suggest:

determining whether the first displacement data represents a displacement that exceeds a predetermined maximum value at which the board is rendered defective;

if the represented displacement does not exceed the predetermined maximum value, correcting, based on said first displacement data, design data to be used for processing said board after said board is covered with said first insulating layer to form a wiring pattern connected to said first electrical component; and

if the represented displacement does exceed the predetermined maximum value, performing no corrections,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for determining whether the displacement value between a design position and an actual position exceeds a predetermined maximum value at which the board is rendered defective, and performs corrections on design data to be used for processing the board after the board is covered with a first insulating layer only if the value does not exceed the predetermined maximum value. In this manner, the invention of claim 1 serves to further increase the fabrication yield because seriously defective parts that cannot be remedied by the correction process can be completely eliminated.

Taff et al. and Leedy, either alone or in combination, do not disclose these features of claim 1, so that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Taff et al. and Leedy. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 7-8, 11-13, 15, and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 7-8, 11-13, 15, and 17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Taff et al. and Leedy, alone or in combination, do not discuss or suggest:

determining whether the first displacement data represents a displacement that exceeds a predetermined maximum value at which the board is rendered defective;

if the represented displacement does not exceed the predetermined maximum value, correcting, based on said first displacement data, design data to be used for processing said board after said board is covered with said first insulating layer to form a wiring pattern connected to said first electrical component; and

if the represented displacement does exceed the predetermined maximum value, performing no corrections,

as recited in amended claim 19, so that claim 19 patentably distinguishes over Taff et al. and Leedy. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22, 25-26, 29-31, 33, and 35 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 19, and include all the features of claim 19, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 20, 22, 25-26, 29-31, 33, and 35 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Taff et al. and Leedy, alone or in combination, do not discuss or suggest:

determining whether the first displacement data represents a displacement that exceeds a predetermined maximum value at which the board is rendered defective;

if the represented displacement does not exceed the predetermined maximum value, correcting, based on said first displacement data, design data to be used for processing said board after said board is covered with said first insulating layer to form a wiring pattern connected to said first electrical component; and

if the represented displacement does exceed the predetermined maximum value, performing no corrections,

as recited in amended claim 49, so that claim 49 patentably distinguishes over Taff et al. and Leedy. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/612,222

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5-27-08

By: 

Aaron C. Walker  
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501